



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

competency in international law and of the highest moral reputation to serve as members of the court. This will make a possible body of one hundred and four arbitrators. It is hardly likely that the full number will be appointed by each of the Powers. Some of the smaller Powers may, in accordance with a provision of the Convention, unite in choosing the same persons, and some may appoint only one or two. From the permanent body thus appointed five (or, by agreement, any other number) are to be chosen to determine any case of international controversy which may be referred to the court.

By the provisions of the Convention the foreign ministers accredited to The Hague become a permanent council of administration. It becomes their duty, without further commission, to establish a bureau of the court at The Hague, to install the court, to provide administrative measures and help, and then to report yearly to their respective governments the work of the court.

It must not be forgotten that this great Convention provides also for commissions of inquiry, to investigate the facts out of which controversies arise; and also that any government may, of its own motion, offer mediation between two disputing states without this being considered an unfriendly act.

We do not need to repeat here what we have previously said as to the supreme importance of this permanent international tribunal, the establishment of which we are to see completed in this year 1900. We cannot understand, in the light of this great fact, the mental movements of those who persist in declaring that the Hague Conference, because it did not abolish or begin the abolishment of the overgrown armaments of Europe, was abortive. There is no other thing — not even a truce of armaments — which it might have done, equal in positive importance to what it did in providing for this court. Without this, any arrangement for reduction of armaments would have gone to pieces before the delegates got home from The Hague. Even with this, any such arrangement would probably have been a dead letter till the court was in satisfactory operation and established in public confidence.

This permanent arrangement for the pacific settlement of international controversies is almost the first entrance of clear light into the gloomy and distracting chaos of international complications. The nations establishing it will feel in honor bound to use it in all ordinary cases. Confidence in it will grow with use. Its existence will be a standing exaltation of reason and right, a perpetual condemnation of wrong and violence, a ceaseless challenge to keep the sword sheathed. More and more serious controversies will in time be carried before it. The result will be, almost immediately, to bring the present system of armaments into greater discredit. Thus the way will be prepared, by this first great constructive step in

permanent international organization, for a speedy truce of armaments, then for reduction, and finally for the disappearance, gradually, of armaments in their present form.

We should all have been crazed with delight if the Hague Conference had been able with a blow to crush the whole inhuman system of modern armaments out of existence. We should not fail, however, to be duly, perhaps much more sensibly, thankful that it was wise and courageous enough, in the face of distrust and not a little ridicule, to lay the permanent foundation of a new international political order, which means much more than the abolition of war and its instruments. This court for the adjustment of international differences will remain a part of the permanent pacific order of the world, after men have totally and forever abandoned the sin of shooting and stabbing one another to death.

Editorial Notes.

The Cry for Peace.

The most encouraging thing we find in the present darkness of war and bloodshed is the cry for peace that has gone up throughout Christendom. In this country, whichever side of the Transvaal War has one's sympathies, the desire that the war should come to a speedy end has been practically universal. Many petitions from all parts of the country have gone to Washington asking for mediation, and ten times as many would have gone if there had been any hope that the President would act. On the continent of Europe the movement for mediation has been deep and widespread, going far beyond the limits of the peace organizations. In England the movement for a cessation of hostilities and a fair settlement of the South African troubles has been brave and persistent. It has grown steadily in strength and influence. Beyond the peace societies who have labored day and night, four organizations, numbering in their membership many leading men in state and church and private life, have steadily worked for peace in face of the war fury that has raged in England. The Transvaal Committee, the South African Conciliation Committee, the Stop-the-War Committee and an organization of several hundred liberals, each in its own field, have made a contest against the iniquity of the war which shows that England is not yet hopelessly militarized and imperialized. No finer utterances, in behalf of liberty, right, justice and the sacred principles of the religion professed by Anglo-Saxons have ever fallen from the lips of Englishmen than in these days of stress. This is a phenomenon which has never appeared before during any British war. In the long list of distinguished persons who have arraigned the government for its persistence in iniquity, none have been more conspicuous than

the leading preachers, from some of whom we have heretofore quoted. Here is an utterance of an eminent Catholic, Dr. William Barry, the spirit of which is most admirable:

"I can pray for peace, and I do so; I can ask that all suffering may be spared which is not requisite to teach men a lesson, to correct or to warn them against the vices now rampant among us of money-worship and luxurious self-seeking; I can pray heartily in the only fit language, 'God defend the right'; but as a Christian, a Catholic and a priest, how shall I take upon myself the burden of dictating to the Almighty what issue he shall give to a combat like this? I do not understand the patriotism which makes to itself a national God, English, Dutch or African; and accordingly I decline to lay upon the altar my personal prejudices in the shape of a petition for victory to the side where birth or position happens to have placed me."

Porto Rican Muddle.

Nothing better illustrates the ridiculous incongruities into which the country is brought by the effort to make our national principles something which they are not than the attempted legislation for Porto Rico. The President, advised by his special commissioner and by the dictates of right and benevolence, recommends free trade, as is the logical thing if the island is now United States territory. Forthwith the sugar and tobacco interests, in spite of the poverty and pressing needs, and also the rights of the island, are up in arms, as if free trade with this bit of territory half the size of New Jersey would drive them all out of business. As a pretense, they put forward the plea that such a precedent of free trade would lay down a course which would have to be followed in the case of the other "new possessions,"—an appeal which proves irresistible. But they are willing to give Porto Rico eighty-five per cent. of standing as a part of the country, and a bill imposing fifteen per cent. of the Dingley duties is pushed through. The President, contrary to his first advice, lifting his ear again from the ground, approves this and is anxious to have it become law. But the storm raised about his ears by members of his party throughout the country, because of this unfair treatment of Porto Rico, makes him nervous, and he rushes into the House with a message advising that revenues amounting to two millions of dollars collected during the past year be paid back to Porto Rico. And forthwith it is voted to pay them back. Free trade and tariff, a part of the nation and a hopeless outsider, eighty-five per cent free and fifteen per cent. vassal, worthy to be treated on its own merits, but rejected lest a precedent dangerous to imperialism be established,—such is the disgraceful treatment of an island about whose destiny the forces of freedom and political vassalage are playing in utter confusion. And this is the

wisdom and fine insight with which this nation is meeting its "new obligations"! The Porto Ricans may not have much sense, but they have enough to see clear through this selfish and small meanness, and it is not strange that their hatred has been aroused against everything American. The opponents of imperialism may well lie low and laugh, and let these sage solvers of the new questions do their work for them. If little Porto Rico gives the imperialists such spasms of political pain, what will become of them when they tackle the larger questions?

Grant Allen Hated War.

In 1898 the late Mr. Grant Allen wrote to the proprietor of the "Canadian Year Book," who had asked for a contribution in support of military development, the following expression of his hatred of war:

"You can know very little of my aims and ideals if you think I would willingly do anything to help on a work whose avowed object is to arouse 'military enthusiasm.' Military enthusiasm means enthusiasm for killing people; my desire in life has been not to kill, but to help and aid all mankind, irrespective of nationality, creed, language or color. I hate war, and everything that leads to it, as I hate murder, rapine or the ill treatment of women. I dislike slavery, however cloaked under the disguise of 'Imperialism.' I contribute gladly to works designed to strengthen the bonds of amity between nations and to render war impossible; but I cannot contribute to one which aims at making peaceable Canadian citizens throw themselves into the devouring whirlpool of militarism. Excuse my plain avowal. A bishop is hardly flattered if you ask him to write in favor of atheism, or a prominent temperance advocate if you ask him for a rousing drinking song calculated to raise an enthusiasm for whiskey."

Nicaragua Canal.

The obstacle offered by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty to the building and ownership of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States has been removed by the new convention negotiated by Secretary Hay and Lord Pauncefoot, the full text of which we give on another page. The new treaty is an admirable one. It allows the United States to construct, directly or indirectly, and to regulate this important waterway between the Atlantic and the Pacific, but it preserves the principle of neutralization of the canal contained in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and fortifies it by more definite and exact statement of the elements entering into the neutralization. The scope of the former treaty is also greatly extended by the provision that all the other nations may become parties to it. As soon as the Senate has ratified the convention and the ratifications are exchanged, Secretary Hay will address identical notes to all the maritime powers with the view of securing their adhesion to the project for the perpetual

neutralization of the canal. We cannot doubt that they will hasten to assent to the terms of the convention, and we shall thus have another important bond of good feeling, union and coöperation between the Powers. This is the disposition of the canal, if ever built, or practically the disposition which we have always advocated. It is about the same as that of the Suez Canal. It is certain now to be the ultimate disposition of all the international waterways of the world. This new convention does not interfere in the least with the obligations of the United States towards the republics of Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Secretary Hay, who is proving one of the soundest and best-spirited men who has ever been at the head of the State department, expects to observe most scrupulously the obligations due to these republics, in securing in the proper way whatever concessions may be essential to the construction and operation of the canal.

Influence of the Church. The *Herald of Peace* quotes the following remarks of Sir Edward Clarke, M. P., in regard to the warlike influence of the Church in England during the present crisis:

"I am very sorry to have to say that I think in the present temper of the public mind the appointment of a day of public humiliation and prayer would only provoke a mischievous and most unseemly controversy.

"The mere suggestion has produced a correspondence in which those who minister in Christ's Church have repudiated their Master's plainest teaching, and laymen scoff at the idea of the divine government of the world.

"A day so set apart would be kept as a holiday, and pulpits would be used, as they are being used every Sunday, to inflame the pride and passion of our people and to dull and sear their consciences. So far as any Christian spirit is left in the church, it can find expression in the prayers of the liturgy better than in occasional prayers in which much less of that spirit is to be found."

Duty of the Church. A very able article on "The New Crusade Against War," published some time ago in *La Liberté Chrétienne* at Lausanne, Switzerland, thus speaks of the duty of the Church on the subject of peace:

"The Church ought to be the conscience, the compass of society. But how often this compass has found itself out of order and has led astray those whose mission it was to guide! This is particularly the case in regard to the question which I have in view, that of peace. On this subject as on many others the testimony rendered by the Christian churches has been singularly defective, illogical, contradictory. They have allowed to stand and have even contributed their part in promoting the legend of 'the Lord of hosts.' I should not be surprised if to-day the majority of readers when questioned as to the sense of this Biblical expression, 'the Lord of hosts,' would respond that it is synonymous with 'God of battles,' God of force and of military success. This

would be completely erroneous, for it never had this sense. Among the passages of the Bible where it is found there are only one or two where there is even an allusion to military events. The 'Lord of hosts' is the God who created 'the heavens and all their host,' that is the stars, which he has marshaled in the limitless fields of space, assigning to each its place, as a general does his troops. It means, then, the God of order and of wisdom rather than of force. And people have made of him the 'God of battles'! And the Christian churches have instituted solemn *Te Deums* in his honor! The cathedrals are rare under whose vaults has not remained some trace of this incense mixed with gunpowder. Even our Reformed churches, wholly won in theory to the cause of peace, have not given forth on the subject a sufficiently faithful and constant utterance. The secretary of the Peace Bureau at Berne wrote me some time ago: 'It is surprising that, in general, the ministers of the different denominations hold aloof from the peace movement, of which they ought to be the most ardent leaders.' It is necessary to reaffirm from time to time that the 'Lord of hosts' is the God of order, that is of peace."

Let Both Cry Halt. Hon. Auberon Herbert, after tracing out in the February *Contemporary Review* the various errors, blunders, misrepresentations and lies in what he calls the "Tragedy of Errors" which led to the Transvaal War, gives the following advice as to what ought to be done:

"I answer, let both nations make confession of their huge folly. We have both made under bad guidance complete fools of ourselves. We have both of us — we the British in the higher degree — been stupid, proud, masterful, quarrelsome like children, suspicious, petty and perverse in our methods of bargaining, and filled with a dangerous contempt for each other. We have both believed in the final resort to force, and we have both believed — in our conceit — that the path of easy victory lay open before us. We have both been sharply awakened from our careless dreams by the sufferings which have fallen alike to the share of both of us. We have both passed through the fires of our own kindling; we have both reaped what we have sown, and now let us both take to heart and profit by the lesson we have learned. Let us put from us the vainglorious talking in which we have both of us indulged. Let us put from us the passion and delirium of a fatal moment, pull ourselves together, and act with the sober sense and self-discipline that is, as we believe, the heritage of both races. Enough blood, and far more than enough, has stained hill and veldt. Let us both cry halt to our soldiers. Let the most sane-minded and level-headed man that we have in the country be sent out. Let an armistice be arranged on terms of perfect equality. Whatever may have happened before these words are printed, whether we have gained a military success or not, neither side should claim victory, neither side should be asked to confess defeat or to undergo any humiliation. Each side should bear its own losses, whatever they may be. We should treat all this hideous drama of the last three months as a dream gone by and forgotten, as a thing that has now become

simply non-existent. We should wipe it clean off the slate, leaving it to be the mere property of the historian. We should go straight back to the position of August, and take up the negotiations exactly at the point where they left the hands of Mr. Smuts and Mr. Conyngham Greene, and go steadily and patiently through the work as if it had never been interrupted."

Alas! Simpleton! as Carlyle would say. What ought to be done is never done when a victor has his enemy down. What is then done is dictated by force and not by right, justice and goodwill.

Russia and Japan. The *American Monthly Review of Reviews* remarks as follows upon the relations between Russia and Japan:

"There is no particular danger of a war between Russia and England, but close observers are of the opinion that Japan and Russia may come to blows at almost any moment. Reports have emanated from Russia to the effect that a good understanding has been reached with the Japanese, but these reports must be received with some skepticism. For several years the Japanese have regarded a war with Russia as inevitable, and they prefer to have it before the Trans-Siberian Railway is finished and while Japan's naval strength is decidedly superior to that of Russia in the Pacific. The Japanese consider themselves rightly entitled to Port Arthur and they aspire to dominate Korea. Their influence is now very great at Peking. They have known how to play upon the reactionary and anti-European sentiments of the dowager Empress of China, and it is supposed that they are largely responsible for that lady's recent policy. It is expected that Japanese officers will reorganize the Chinese army on a modern footing, and that a firm alliance will be established between these two kindred empires. That it will be the policy of this alliance to cultivate the friendship of England and the United States, while opposing the Asiatic encroachments of Russia, can readily be believed. In short, a movement by Japan against Russia at this time, when the Muscovites want quiet in that quarter in order to make bold gains elsewhere, would be thought to point directly to a close understanding between England and Japan, if not an actual alliance."

War not Inevitable.

In connection with the above, it is pertinent to remark that nothing can be more mischievous in the relations of two nations than the belief in one or both of them that a war or "one more war" between them is inevitable. This belief in nine cases out of ten comes from the secret or open wish that a war may come. Furthermore, the belief consciously or unconsciously causes those who hold it to put forth their influence to bring about that which they believe is sure to come. If the Japanese want a war with Russia, as many of them probably do, that is a sufficient cause for their thinking it inevitable and steadily preparing for it. The present criminal talk of war between England and France as unavoidable springs out

of a similar state of mind. Without the state of mind, circumstances would have little to do with disturbing the peaceful relations of the two nations. We have often heard it said, on the streets of Boston and in other places, that we "must have one more war with England in order to bring her to her senses." Such a sentiment is frequently held and uttered by persons from whom one would expect better things. Just here lies the root of a vast amount of existing international confusion and foreboding. All the inevitableness there is about war, about any war, is that which people make. If they themselves were less "inevitably" narrow, selfish and ambitious and given to revenge, the fatality supposed to reside in war would be as harmless as the tooth of a poisonless snake.

In spite of the wars now going on in South Africa and elsewhere, the following statements of Ex-Speaker Reed, in a recent number of the *Saturday Evening Post*, Philadelphia, as to the decay of war are essentially true, even that with regard to the "preacher" being, we are sorry to say, sadly too exact:

"Men have found by experience — which is another name for knowledge — that it does not pay in the long run to destroy property, and hereafter they will find out that it does not pay to destroy life. War is dying out because men have something else to do. They are engaged in trade, in enterprises which war interferes with. Life is getting every day to be better worth living. Hence men do not want to lose it. When the life of men, like the life of Australian Diggers, was only an alternation of starving and eating to such repletion as made them roll on the ground in agonies of surfeit, a man must have been very particular who cared whether there was war or not. But when the interests of all nations get so universally interwoven with the warp and woof of trade that the knowledge of its devastations will be brought home to all men, war will cease. But the proclamation that there shall be no more war will come from the tradesman and not from the preacher. What have religion and morality done with war? War is a beastly barbarism. It is only murder on a large scale, with ranked battalions and pomp and circumstance. Eighteen Christian centuries have not abolished it."

Century of Peace.

In the reception recently given by the Lotus Club of New York to Andrew Carnegie, Hon. Bourke Cockran uttered these sentences:

"I am glad to see any man take an interest in his fellow. Our economic law, in its advance, has come around to the saying of the Master, that man should love his neighbor as himself. Service is the truest love. Mr. Carnegie has done his service by helping men to help themselves, not in the charity which degrades giver and receiver alike. Gentlemen, the question for the twentieth century will not be for the field of battle. We are now seeing the dying efforts of barbarism. The coming century will be one of peace. The hands of men will be

set, not at each others' throats, but at the fertile earth to wring subsistence from her. The leader will be that man who shall reconcile man with man; who preaches the doctrine that service is no longer existence; that the relations of labor to capital are the relations of partnership. Then will come the era of prosperity for all. We shall come to know that the earth can support us all; that destitution comes only from crime and vice. Whoever preaches peace, preaches progress. He preaches time when destitution will disappear; not poverty, for poverty is the mainspring of progress. What is poverty now was abundance last century. What is abundance now will be poverty a hundred years in the future. We are indebted for this progress to the men who have led in practical philanthropy, recognizing the partnership of man in industry, and the brotherhood of man the world over."

Carrying Weapons.

Much of the recent trouble in Kentucky is to be attributed to the custom of carrying deadly weapons, still so common in that State. The practice is not confined to the mountainous districts, but is prevalent more or less in many other parts of the State. But for this fact the Goebel-Taylor controversy would probably not have resulted in bloodshed and murder. But given the political corruption present in the controversy and belts full of revolvers, and it is a marvel that scores of people were not killed. If the carrying of concealed weapons were as prevalent in New York or Philadelphia as in Kentucky, we should long ago have had ugly scenes of blood in the streets and public buildings of these cities, whose political corruption, if not essentially worse in character, is much more extensive and subtle than in Kentucky. The people of Kentucky, the mass of whom deplore the Frankfort proceedings as much as any of us do, ought to inaugurate a vigorous campaign, not only against the political methods of the corrupt party leaders, but also for the suppression of the revolver. It is a disgrace to the State that in open daylight men can appear on the streets of the capital brandishing these deadly instruments and not be treated at once as violators of the law. The mountaineers and low-class people cannot be expected to do differently so long as the civilization of the cities allows men prominent in politics to arm themselves with revolvers, go into the streets and shoot down their enemies, then go scot-free of punishment and manipulate themselves into the candidacy for the governorship.

Secretary's Lectures.

Secretary Trueblood delivered during the month of February twenty-three lectures in different cities of Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia and South Carolina. The subjects used were "European Militarism," "The Hague Conference" and "The Federation of the World." He was received everywhere with the greatest kindness and courtesy, and

the audiences all showed sincere and often very strong sympathy with his arraignment of the militarism of the Old World, and his appeal that the United States should at once stop the dangerous inroads which militarism is making in this country. The *Alkahest*, published at Atlanta by the Lyceum under whose auspices the lectures were given, speaks thus of the lecture on "Militarism":

"Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood's lecture, 'Militarism,' which he is giving for the Lyceums at present, is nothing less than a revelation. There is neither humor nor oratory, as is demanded in men and subjects of less merit; but one is carried on by the current of interest — appalling facts — into the heart of this 'Colossal Crime of Europe,' until none of the common arts of the platform speaker would be appropriate to the theme. It is the greatest subject handled by the best equipped man in America — one who has studied it until he has the heart and soul of the movement for educating the people to this greatest folly and crime of the ages. If Dr. Trueblood could be heard in every town and city there would arise such an indignant public opinion that it would be impossible to fasten militarism on America. We feel that the *Alkahest* has already done great good by bringing him to the South. A man so scholarly, so in touch with the different nations, and so full of this movement for the emancipation of national crime, hatred and appalling debt burdens, can but prove a broadening and building influence on the whole South."

Brevities.

. . . The provisional program of the Peace Congress, to meet in Paris the first five days of October has been published. The chief subjects to be treated are, the Hague Conference, International Law, Councils of Conciliation, Protection of Native Races, Sanctions of Arbitral Awards, Political and Economic Results of a Future War.

. . . The German navy now has 152 vessels of all types, namely, 17 battleships, 8 ironclads, 11 large cruisers, 27 small cruisers, 5 gunboats and 84 torpedo boats. The new naval program, which will take about 16 years to carry out, will carry the number up to 222, the chief increase, proportionally, to be in battleships.

. . . "Why should it be expected that the teaching and example of Christ should be accepted and practised, if while calling him the Prince of Peace we talk of 'civilized warfare,' extol the 'patriotism' of the fighter and killer and equip our boys with the toggery of military display and with firearms?"— *Union Signal*.

. . . The Lodge Immigration Bill, which failed in the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth Congress, is on the calendar of the present Congress, and Mr. Lodge hopes for its early passage.

. . . "The most valuable man in a nation is not the man who follows public opinion, but the man who stands up when you are all mad and preaches to you the blessings of peace."— *Andrew Carnegie*.

. . . "Mebby my mind hain't built right to see the beauty of two great nations, pledged to peace and enlightenment, waging bloody wars six months after a Peace Conference. They say they believe the Bible and want